DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 292 HE 013 800

AUTHOR Martorana, S. V.
TITLE Regionalism: A Postsecondary Education Strategy Yet Undefined.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. Inservice Education Program.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
SPONS AGENCY Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.
REPORT NO IEP-903-2
PUB DATE Feb 77
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education (Orlando, FL, February 1977).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Planning; Cooperative Planning; Federal Government; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Needs Assessment; *Postsecondary Education; *Regional Cooperation; Regional Planning; Shared Services; State Government; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Seminars for State Leaders Postsec Ed (ECS SHEEO)

ABSTRACT

The idea of regionalism and its implementation are considered, along with the institutional, state, and federal governmental interests to which regionalism appears to be related. A study of regionalism found it was seen as an interinstitutional, cooperative arrangement officially recognized by an authoritative agency in the state and thus distinguishable from consortia arrangements. It was found that 60 percent of the states are actively engaged in regionalism as an aspect of planning and coordinating postsecondary educational resources. A primary factor that seems to encourage regionalism is the leadership posture assumed by state-level boards or commissions. Most plans were characterized by the following patterns: seeking to meet broad postsecondary educational needs within each of several geographic regions established throughout the state; seeking to meet the postsecondary educational needs of a special, particular geographical subsection of a state; dealing with a single academic program or a single subsection of postsecondary education; and involving either the entire state or a subsection of the state with either the entire state or subsections of other states. Most states reported that a better utilization of resources was the objective pursued. Regionalism is implemented predominantly by three types of authority: administrative authority possessed by the executive branch or an agency of state government, legislative authority expressed in statutes, and authority held by established postsecondary educational institutions. In organizational terms, the regionalization approaches appeared to have weak structures for governance and administration. It was found that state and institutional funds were most heavily utilized. (SW)

ED202292

Inservice Education Program (IEP)

Paper Presented at a Seminar for State Leaders in Postsecondary Education

REGIONALISM: A POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION STRATEGY YET UNDEFINED

S. V. MARTORANA

Professor of Education; College of Education
Research Associate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Pennsylvania State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

FGS

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Orlando, Florida
February 1977

IEP Reprint No. 903-2

HE 013 800

Education Commission of the States

Inservice Education Program (IEP)
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

SHEEO

The IEP Program has been supported primarily by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation with additional funds from the Education Commission of the States, the Frost Foundation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers

"Regionalism: A Postsecondary Education Strategy Yet Undefined"

by

S.V. Martorana
Professor of Education; College of Education
Research Associate, Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Planners of this conference are obviously extraordinarily courageous people, for they have combined into one topic -- the main theme of the conference — two of the most hotly debated topics in postsecondary education today. "Policy and planning strategies" are much in demand for many reasons, some of which will be developed later in this paper, and are being suggested from many quarters with varying degrees of clarity in their definition and job logic and analytical study to support them -- but almost always with much conviction of their advocates. A general expression of interest in and advocacy of "lifelong learning" is also a part of the order of the day in American postsecondary education; the term, however, is a "catch all" phrase found used in the literature of the field to convey a wide range of meanings and usually carrying a connotation that the general adult population of the nation should also be seen as a population of students. Putting the two concepts of policy and planning strategies and lifelong learning together to be the joint subjects of attention at this conference is, therefore, an act of bold inquiry, an act to be both noted and commended for that trait.

The invitation to attend the conference and to present this paper came to me, I understand, because of my involvement in a project which also touches on the two main interests of the day. Over the past three years I have been taking a preliminary look at regionalism in postsecondary education in the United States, and recently a more intensive examination of the development and implementation of the regionalism was initiated. My assignment today, then, as I understand it, is twofold: the first part of my task is to report on the current status and findings of my inquiry into regionalism, and the second is to relate both the concept itself and what we have learned about it so far to the current dynamics of institutional interaction with state and federal interests in postsecondary education. To accomplish these purposes, this paper is cast into two sections, the first dealing with the idea of regionalism and its implementation, and the second discussing the dynamics of interaction of institutional, state, and federal governmental interests to which regionalism appears to be related.

Regionalism and Regionalization

That American postsecondary education is experiencing strong pressures to be pushed beyond the campuses of individual colleges and universities is a well documented observation. Limitations of time and space prohibit a full review of that literature here. The pressures were noted in several places by the Carnegie Commission[1] and are the subject of many shorter treatises. One of the best in my judgment is entitled, "The Interdependence of Higher Education," by Joseph A. Cronin, in which he suggests, "Higher education

institutions may need to prepare a declaration of interdependence as part of the survival strategy for the 1980s," as the answer to two pressing questions he raises, "What happened to the exalted precious, and separate state of higher education? Why must totally isolated colleges and universities work together?"[2]

The Baseline Study

Regionlism may be a declaration of postsecondary interdependence made for it as well as by it. This can be said because both external state agencies with official authority to act in postsecondary education and individual institutions are involved in it. For purposes of the baseline study which covered the years 1973-1975,[3] regionalism was defined as that view of a geographic sub-section of a state (or of several adjoining states) which considers all (or a number) of the postsecondary educational components collectively and seeks to establish a coordinated relationship of their goals, programs, and/or resources. That is the idea, regionalism as a concept; regionalization is then simply the acts or processes by which the concept is put into practice; the implementation of regionalism is regionalization. It is manifested, obviously, in some form of interinstitutional, cooperative arrangement.

For purposes of our study, however, we attached another criterion for inclusion of interinstitutional arrangements into the counts of practice we wanted to describe; it was that the regional arrangement be one that, in some way or another, was officially recognized by an authoritative agency in the state. This could be, naturally, the Governor or Legislature by executive action or statute, or a

state-level coordinating or governing board responsible for post-secondary education in whole or in part in the state.

This matter of official recognition is important, for it is a way to separate the concept of regionalism as an aspect of statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary education from the more general phenomenon of consortia which are more typically ad hoc, voluntary, interinstitutional arrangements. These merit attention because (1) they are in some sense forerunners of regionalism, (2) because they are in some cases coming into the process of recognized, official regionalism, and (3) because they provide already some basis of experience from which officials considering regionalism can profit. Identification and preliminary examination of these consortia dates back now nearly 20 years,[4] but in recent years, the person most directly following this development is Lewis D. Patterson, headquartered until recently in the AAHE. For several years he has produced an annual count of formally organized consortiums. The 1975 count is 106. But, as he says, this is only a small glimpse of the interinstitutional connections emerging throughout the land:

> "Numbers at best only tell a part of the cooperative movement. In the past two years new areas are receiving increased attention such as among community colleges, in continuing education, in medical and health programs, in military programs, in theology and in the arts. Two trends to observe in the future will be: the movement to state regionalization where it becomes increasingly difficult to distinguish between voluntary and statuatory systems; and a broadening of the base of participation to include the full range of the postsecondary community and related community/regional agencies in cooperative arrangements."[5]

In passing, one should note for the record that the achievements of consortia to date are not very impressive. Franklin Patterson (no relation to Lew, I'm told) paints a dim view of their attainments as contrasted to their aspirations in a book-length treatment entitled Colleges in Consort: Institutional Cooperation Through Consortia.[6]

But McGuire and I discovered much stronger interest and action in regionalism and regionalization than we expected to discover. Here only a few highlights from the study can be reported, for time and space are limited.

Level of Interest and Activity -- Some 60% (31 of 50) of the states are actively engaged in regionalism as an aspect of planning and coordinating postsecondary educational resources. Most of this activity is concentrated in the Middle Atlantic, Southeastern, and Midwestern regions of the nation. Some correlation seems evident that larger states and those with more complex enterprises in postsecondary education, are more actively concerned with regionalism than those that encompass smaller geographic areas or have less diversity in postsecondary educational services within their boundaries. In several states, more than one officially recognized approach to regionalism is operative. In some, this is because of separate actions by different agencies, each operating within its own spheres of authority; and in others, the same agency is applying regionalism in different ways to different elements of the postsecondary educational enterprise for which they are responsible.

Altogether the 45 regionalization patterns in 31 different

states, with the number under study nearly one-half of the total in effect, support a clear conclusion that activity as well as interest in regionalism and regionalization will remain high for some time. This conclusion, furthermore, is reinforced by the statements advanced by the state officials surveyed to the effect that the pressures now operative to stimulate regionalism in their states will be at hand at least for the foreseeable future.

Influencing Factors — Beyond the generally observed forces in society and economy of the nation which create pressures on postsecondary education for a higher level of accountability to its constituencies, several factors seem to encourage regionalism when they exist in a state. A primary one is the leadership posture assumed and role played by state-level boards or commissions with official responsibility for the general surveillance of a state's postsecondary educational enterprise or for a major segment of that enterprise. Such agency leadership far outranked any other influencing factor in the reports provided by the states for this study: 36 plans in 24 states were so described.

Although falling far behind the frequency reported for state agencies, the role of legislative actions merits attention, for in 12 states, and 13 regionalization plans (9 in effect and 4 under study) this involvement was reported. The developmental experience of other earlier organizational shifts in American postsecondary education, for example, the community colleges demonstrate that permissive or enabling legislation abets the organizational change and considerably accelerates action concerning it. Whether or not

this will be a distinguishable feature with respect to regionalization, of course, remains to be seen.

Finally, of note is the influential role of special studies of postsecondary education as presently operating in the state. Whether done as internal projects by staffs of state agencies or special commissions, or by outside specialists or consultants for either standing or ad hoc auspices within the state, the accomplishment of special studies are also often mentioned as factors contributing to regionalism and consequent action to implement the concept.

Patterns of Regionalization — As yet no generalizable pattern appears evident among the approaches reported to regionalism by the several states. Among the five patterns identified from the descriptions of the 45 regionalization plans available, the three encompassing most plans were: borad regional needs -- a pattern which seeks to meet broad postsecondary educational needs within each of several geographic regions established throughout the state (12 plans); specific areas needs — a pattern to meet the postsecondary educational needs of a special, particular geographic sub-section of a state (15 plans); and specific program or section needs -- a pattern dealing with a single academic program or a single sub-section of postsecondary education (15 plans). Interstate arrangements -- a pattern involving either the entire state or a sub-section of a state with either the entire state or sub-sections of other states applied to 10 plans. The remaining pattern (institutional diversification -- a pattern of official encouragement of voluntary institutional actions to complement and supplement each

other in a given area or program to develop a greater level of diversification in postsecondary education) was found applicable only to three plans.

At this moment in the development of postsecondary education, there is no evident justification for support of any one or even a few of the several patterns identified. It may well be the case that each can be supported as an approach to regionalism having in each case its own merit. Put another way, there may be different purposes held for regionalism in a given state which to accomplish will require different rather than a common pattern of regionalization. This possibility is another of the continuing lines of inquiry to which further efforts needs to be applied.

Objectives of Regionalism -- This study established clearly that there are indeed different purposes held for regionalism in a particular state and for different regionalization plans. Most states reporting on their purposes (23 out of 24) stated that a better utilization of resources was the objective pursued and this goal was set for 34 plans examined. This was the predominant purpose and reflects the pressures for more efficiency and productivity put upon state-level planning and coordinating agencies at this time.

No other purpose was even close to the goal of more effective resource utilization. The goal of increasing postsecondary educational opportunity and services in a region ran a poor second, 12 states and 17 plans. None of the other purposes identified (improving interinstitutional communications, helping form a base for long range planning, and strengthening systems as organizations) were

found to include as many as 10 states or plans.

Sources of Authority — Regionalism is implemented predominantly by three types of authority: administrative authority possessed by the executive branch or an agency of state government, legislative authority expressed in statutes, and authority held by established postsecondary educational institutions. Among these three, far and away the most common authoritative source giving life to regionalism is that held by administrative units in state government, sometimes the governor, as chief executive, but more often a state board of regents or statewide educational planning agency. This last was the case in nineteen states and twenty-two plans.

To be noted, however, because of the known effect that legislative authorization has upon developments statewide and across state lines when a significant number of legislatures act in a common direction, is the sizeable number of states and plans touched directly by the statutes. This was reported to be the case in nine states relating to ten plans, eight in effect and two under study. Some further importance may be evident in that all of these were in the New England, Mid-Atlantic, and North Central States; none was found in states grouped into the Western or Southeastern regions of the nation.

Contrary to the expectation first held in this study, relatively few officially recognized regional plans derive from simple authority of the postsecondary institutions involved. This was found present in four states relating to four plans. This finding is not interpreted, however, as suggesting that few voluntary

interinstitutional arrangements to meet regional needs are to be found, for the facts show us this is clearly not true -- there are many. What it does seem to indicate, however, is that many of these have not yet been given an officially recognized status by a state-level agency with statewide authority -- one essential element in the definition set to identify regionalism plans in this study. If regionalism and regionalization continue to attract increasing attention by statewide planning and coordinating agencies, such recognition of arrangements already set in motion by institutional action may show an increase.

Governance and Administration -- As yet the structural arrangements attached to regionalism plans are amorphous; this seems to be the only tenable generalization coming from the information provided in response to the relatively unstructured call for descriptive information used in the study; while the reports both dwelt often at length on other matters of interest, the matter of structure reflected much lower awareness or special interest. When the fifteen states and twenty-four plans for which information did come forth were examined, no more than a half-dozen or so (both of states and plans) reflected common practices in governance and administrative structure: this was true with respect to use of advisory boards, involvement of institutional governing boards, use of institutional member representation, and use of state agency representation.

The immature organizational status of the regionalization approaches in organizational terms is also evident in the fact that

single, executive leadership is rarely present. Only three plans in as many states were reported to have an executive director.

Here again a caveat against possible misinterpretation should be advanced: it could be quite erroneous to conclude that since the present evidence of structure for governance and administration is weak, movement toward such organizational development will not occur. Again, the history of institutional developments tells a contrary conclusion. The matter needs more examination and more watching. It may well be, furthermore, that even incipient, early expressions of interest in developing more organizational identify to regionalization plans are suppressed to forestall their being viewed as threats to existing institutions or other established patterns for administering postsecondary education in a region. When a positive, cooperative, and nonthreatening perception of regionalism can be established and maintained, chances of implementing plans to succeed are much greater than when the opposite situation exists.

Funding Patterns -- As in the case of governance and administrative structures, this preliminary study did not get into the question of financing patterns for regionalization as an in-depth examination. Some useful data on nine regionalization plans in six states did come forward. These indicated that state and institutional funds were most heavily utilized; federal funds served to help two plans in two states and the same was true for use of private funds. Only two plans, one in New York and one in Illinois, drew on three different sources of funds; both used state and institutional funds, but while one of the two used federal funds as

the third source, the other relied on private resources.

Some Tentative Conclusions — Current literature in higher education abounds with news about the process of change in which the nation's postsecondary educational institutions are involved. A scholarly commission calls for concern for "More than Survival," (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975)[7]; the executive head of a major national higher education association stumps the country, calling for a new national movement toward, "community-based, performance-oriented, postsecondary education," (Gleazer, 1974)[8]; the federal government passes legislation calling for state commissions for "state postsecondary education commissions" to carry on "comprehensive statewide planning" of "all public and private postsecondary educational resources in the state, including planning necessary for such resources to be better coordinated, improved, expanded, or altered so that all persons within the state who desire, and who can benefit from, postsecondary education may have the opportunity to do so." (Higher Education Amendments of 1972).[9]

All of these developments, and many others in evidence today, suggest that new forms for provision of postsecondary education are in the making. Regionalization plans in, between, and among the several states of the nation, may be one of these and that is why this study is to be a continuing one. A gradutate student in higher education at The Pennsylvania State University perhaps posed the critical question, the answer to which may well determine the future course of regionalism and regionalization in postsecondary education

as an approach to state-level planning to merit regional needs. In the course of a study examining the relative roles of state-level coordinating boards and local, institutional boards of community colleges, he asked, "Does the matter of regional needs represent a 'no man's land' in definition of local versus state authority?" (Sturtz).[10] The question was prompted by his recurrent observation of a split in views held by local as opposed to state officials in postsecondary education as to who should assess regional needs for postsecondary education and should plan for, and set policy to guide an effective educational response to those needs. Regionalism may be the first manifestation of awareness that the "no man's land" exists; and regionalization may be the way to now unclaimed domain of service will be entered without there having to be battle among the several existing post-secondary educational interests who have a claim to the right to serve it.

The Current Inquiry

As is usually the case with a preliminary investigation, the baseline study raised more questions than it provided answers. With both the study and the appetite it whetted for a more penetrating analysis in hand, we approached the Ford Foundation for help to make a truly definitive study of regionalism in post-secondary education. That study is now launched and will be continuing for the next 12-18 months. Besides updating the survey of regionalism in the United States and making the survey in a way to get much more detail about both the scope and depth of

regionalization plans, the current project includes case studies of six or eight states. Under consideration are six states found in the baseline study to be well advanced in their consideration or implementation of regionalization plans; California, Illinois, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Two others, yet to be chosen, are to be added to improve the geographic spread of the case study states; one from the Rocky Mountain and another from the South.

The current study is designed so that it will establish for each state an accurate picture of the extent, if any, to which regionalism of postsecondary educational resources is used in reaching policy decisions in the various aspects of operation such as program coordination and resource allocation. As a second major line of research, it will establish for each regionalization plan identified in its efforts, a detailed description of the purposes, scope, institutional inclusion, and modus operandi of the plan.

Finally, participants in this conference will likely be interested in knowing that the culminating activities of the Ford funded project will either be a national invitational conference or a series of regional ones in the nation to discuss the study's outcomes. Besides this, the usual other discrimination measurers, that is a series of progress reports and a final, summary publication are planned.

Institutional, State, and Federal Interaction

The title of this paper suggests that regionalism in postsecondary education may be viewed as a strategy as yet not fully

defined by which collegiate interests can better accommodate adjustments which current and emerging conditions seem to demand. What are these conditions and how might regionalism and regionalization be related to them? The answer to this is evident in the increasing interaction of postsecondary institutions, with state governments and the federal government. Full development of this interaction is beyond the scope of this paper, (indeed much of this entire conference centers on that topic), but a brief discussion of the interaction as it relates to regionalism is possible.

A general observation should be made at the outset; it is that current and evidently emerging conditions are coalescing to move the focus of postsecondary education out from individual collegiate campuses. Under the new conditions that are taking shape institutional interests as well as those of government at both state and federal levels seem to be forcing a common outcome -- a design for accomplishing the tasks of postsecondary education by a multi-faceted structure rather than one comprised of a single component, or only a few.

Institutional Interests

The catalog of pressures on collegiate institutions to accommodate to new conditions is now so much of the literature that one hesitates to review it again, especially for an audience as well informed on the matter as it assembled here. Out of it all comes notice of at least five that demand institutional action: (1) the leveling off of enrollments of so-called regular college students, that is those recently graduated from high school and

attending college on a full-time basis; (2) the simultaneous new recognition of the older adult student, engaged in post-secondary education only part-time; (3) the increasing difficulty colliegate institutions are encountering in getting the fiscal support they need from their supporting clienteles including the taxpaying public; (4) the trend among all types of colleges, both private and public, to seek public funding, either directly or indirectly; and (5) the increasing accountability requirements imposed on postsecondary educational institutions by a wide range of constituencies claiming a legitimate right to have an accounting provided by the academy.

Faced with the need to respond to all of these pressures, and others, many institutions are concluding that they cannot "go it alone." As a consequence, they exhibit both a more frequent initiative in seeking a collaborative relationship with other postsecondary educational interests and a more positive response when the suggestion of such collaborative arrangements come from others. This conclusion seems well supported by the growing list of voluntary consortiums identified by Lew Patterson as well as isolated special studies like the CUPIR project of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the PSU/CSHE.[11]

Notice the special difficulty that colleges encounter when they try individually to resolve the complex of forces they face. For example, faced with leveling off of enrollments, they may claim a right to make unilateral policy decisions about student recruitment and programs to be offered to attract or hold students, but

simultaneously they may seek public funding. When several different segments of postsecondary education in a state follow that course of action, one of two results seems to be inevitable: right to unilateral action is preserved but fiscal support is still withheld, or, some autonomy is foresaken and a structure that reflects a more responsible accountability to the supporting public is established. It seems unreasonable to assume that collegiate institutions can have both a common source of funding and the right to operate as if in a "free market" model.

State Governmental Interests

The fact that all types of postsecondary educational institutions are increasingly claiming eligibility for public funding, either directly by appropriations to support institutions or indirectly by benefiting from augmented student financial aid programs, is only one of a number of developments that are forcing state governmental interests to view colleges in a collective view as opposed to one which sees them as individual operations. Agencies responsible at the state level must necessarily take a statewide perspective in examining both the state's interests and needs on the one hand, and the total complex of resources that can be called upon to satisfy them on the other; the view called "the global look" in the words of my former collegue in the New York State Education Department, Commissioner of Education Ewald B. Nyquist (now Former Commissioner).

Consider for a moment what are the typical, compelling concerns of a state agency acting responsibly as such. They would include

such broad goals as (1) assuring widespread and impartial access to postsecondary education for all of the citizenry who want and can profit by it; (2) assuring that the education provided is of a reasonable minimal level of quality so that both the student and the general society, as consumers of the educational service provided, are not victimized; (3) assuring that both of these first two goals are achieved at the highest possible level of cost effectiveness, that is, maximum achievement with minimum outlay of costly and scarce personal or material resources; (4) assuring sufficient diversity in programs, locations of programs, types of institutions, and modes of instruction to provide reasonable coverage of the interests of students (a consideration which relates to access) but which also protects against development of a monopoly by single institutions or types of institutions (a consideration which relates to the presentation of quality); and (5) assuring a flexibility in the total enterprise so that unpredicted conditions, if such arise, will not immobilize all activity. (The 1977 winter is teaching us how important this can be.)

Somewhat as an aside here, we should note that it matters little what the state agency is that sets the policies for postsecondary education, the large considerations just stated are compelling. Educators are concerned, (I believe rightly so) about the trend toward loss of control of educational policy formulation to state legislators and governors; to the federal congress and executive agencies; and to the courts.[12] The point here, however,

is that a responsible state-level agency, be it a legislature or a board of regents, cannot escape pressures to meet the interests and needs of the state viewed in a comprehensive fashion.

The reason for cataloguing such commonly known broad goals of an agency when a statewide "global" perspective of postsecondary education is taken is to bring out and emphasize a single point: all of these large state interests suggest a need to rely on a complex of institutions not on any one or, even a, single type. In the jargon of the day "delivery systems" appear to be needed; both a logical analysis of the complex of goals stated above and a close look at the operations of the usual array of colleges found in most states support that conclusion.

If the conclusion and related generalization hold up against critical, logistical appraisal and further empirical observation, the suggestion of regionalism as a constructive, workable approach seems more plausible. Planning and programming on an individual campus basis is too atomistic on an approach; use of the total state may do injustice to some of its parts; regionalism fits best. This is evidently the case at least in such states as California and Florida, among others, where very recent developments, reported to us since the baseline study was published, show sharply heightened interest and activity in regionalism.

Federal Governmental Interests

We now turn to the highest governmental interest in the land, the expression of national policies by the federal government. By the very nature of the program planned for this conference, a great

deal of attention must focus on actions taken recently by the federal government. In the context of its need to cover the subject of regionalism, however, this paper needs necessarily to repeat some of that review of federal legislation as well as to note other types of federal activity that bears on the subject.

There can be little doubt that the Higher Education Act of 1965, the 1972, and the 1976 amendments gave considerable impetus to interinstitutional cooperative action. The effect of Title III of the first act, for example, was to encourage consortia of institutions of many types. The AACJC seized upon its provision to launch a nationwide program to assist developing institutions, grouped in a variety of interstate and intrastate regional combinations. The 1972 amendments brought forth the now famous (at least in postsecondary education planning circles) "1202" statewide, comprehensive planning commissions. All but three states have now established such commissions, and many of them have adopted the concept of regionalism as they set about comprehensive, postsecondary educational planning in their states.

But perhaps the most striking way to show the growing influence of the federal law on interest in regionalism is by noting the several places where notions related to it appear in the latest amendments passed just last summer. From the Higher Education Amendments of 1976 language is used which suggests regionalism in several places. On example is, "supporting resource material sharing programs" (Title I, Part A, Community Services and Continuing Education). The Act goes on to define

that phrase as "planning for the improved use of existing community learning resources by finding ways that combinations of agencies, institutions, and organizations can make better use of existing educational materials, communication technology, local facilities, and such human resources as will expand learning opportunities for adults in the area being served." A state plan developed by an agency which is "broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the State" is necessary to qualify for the federal funds provided.

In another part of the same title, a program is launched to support "Lifelong Learning." After defining this to mean just about any learning or training activity that an adult may wish to pursue, the Act calls upon the Assistant Secretary for Education in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to, "review the lifelong learning opportunities provided through employers, unions, the media, libraries and museums, secondary schools and postsecondary educational institutions, and other public and private organizations to determine means by which the enhancement of their effectiveness and coordination may be facilitated.

In Title IV which has to do with student assistance, a provision is made for assisting states to establish or expand "service learning centers" through "grants or contracts." And in another part of Title IV encourages states to make grants or enter into contracts, "with institutions of higher education, combinations thereof and other agencies or organizations to set up 'Educational Information Centers'."

In Title X, "Establishment and Expansion of Community Colleges," several significant and relevant changes are notable. One is the use of the term "delivery systems" to better serve handicapped, part-time, and students unlikely to continue their education otherwise. Another is the extension of the authority of the "1202 Commissions" in developing statewide plans for community college education "to plan, develop, and carry out interstate cooperative postsecondary education projects."

These illustrations should suffice, but to clench the point that the federal influence is clearly being felt in state-level interest in regionalism, brief mention needs to be made of other laws that push the same ideas. Regionalism can be easily and clearly connected in the language used to describe intent, to suggest structure, and to encourage procedures to implement the Comprehensive Education and Training Act. This is also true in the sections related to state plan development found in the 1976 amendments to the Vocational Education Acts. Indeed, at the recent meeting of the National Advisory Council named to assist us in the extended study of regionalism, the persons most closely involved in state governmental operations called attention to the fact that, beyond the laws, the operating policies of such federal departments or agencies such as the Department of Defense, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Agriculture, as well as Health, Education, and Welfare and the U.S. Office of Education often operated to regionalize postsecondary educational resources both across and within state boundaries.

Here a reference is appropriate to a need to distinguish between the thrusts of different inquiries into the influence of the federal governmental policies (either the statutes or regulations promulgated by operating departments or agencies) on postsecondary education. Most of the inquiries, as Lou Bender's excellent recent research summary discloses,[13] examine the impact of federal laws and regulations on the operations of institutions. Few have examined the influence on statewide planning and coordination; and none have looked at this in terms of regionalism. This our current study proposes to do in some depth and detail.

Conclusion: Toward a Better Strategic Definition

This paper must close on an open-ended note, satisfying or disappointing as this may be to its audience here. Hopefully, some better insight was provided into regionalism and regionalization as an unfolding strategy for postsecondary education to meet the shifting conditions of the late 70s and 80s. Regionalism may over time come to be seen as the operational manifestation of the ideas encompassed in other phrases now showing up in various ways in the literature of postsecondary education. One for example, is the notion of "communiversity" defined to mean a complex of all postsecondary educational resources brought together to meet totally the diverse postsecondary educational needs of sizeable population centers or geographic areas.[14] In all candor, the full impact and potential of regionalism cannot be fully judged at this time. It shows sufficient development and gives evidence of attracting enough notice to merit continued and more refined improvement

as well as analytical study. For the moment, however, we must settle by refining to its nature as well as its potential as "yet undefined."

NOTES

1 For example: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New Students and New Places, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971; The Fourth Revolution, 1971; and Toward A Learning Society, 1971.

2 Joseph M. Cronin. "The Interdependence of Higher Education," Daedalus, Vol. 104, Winter, 1975. pp. 108-112.

3 S.V. Martorana and W. Gary McGuire. Regionalism and Statewide Coordination of Postsecondary Education. The Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education. Report #26. September, 1976.

4 S.V. Martorana, James Messersmith, and Lawrence Nelson, Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities. Circular No. 649, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1961.

5 Lewis D. Patterson, 1975 Consortium Directory, Washington, D.C.: AAHE, 1975. p.v.

6 Franklin Patterson, Colleges in Consort. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

7 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, More Than Survival: Prospects for Higher Education in a Period of Uncertainty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

8 Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Beyond the Open Door, The Open College," Community and Junior College Journal. XLV (August/ September, 1974), 6-12.

9 Higher Education Amendments of 1972, Sections 1202 and 1203.

10 Alan J. Sturtz, "Decision-Making of State Coordinating Boards for Community Colleges and Local Community College Governing Boards in Certain Administrative Policy Areas." (Unpub. Ed.D. Disseration). The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.

11 S.V. Martorana, et al. CUPIR: Cooperative Utilization of Private Institutional Resources: A Multifaceted Thrust for the Private Junior Colleges. The Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education, October 1974.

12 See for example several articles in Compact Vol. II, No. 1, Winter, 1977; and Edward J. Meade, Jr., "Is Law Polluting Our Schools," Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 58, No. 6. February, 1977, pp. 478.

13 Louis Bender, Federal Regulation and Higher Education, Research Report #1. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., 1977.

14 S.V. Martorana and Eileen Kuhns, "Communiversity: A New Challenge," Change, Vol. 9, No. 2, February, 1977. pp. 54-55.